

ARTICLE APPEARED  
ON PAGE A-1

NEW YORK TIMES  
3 AUGUST 1979

ORGI SALT

CHALOI TURNER, Adm.

# 3 SENATORS DEMAND PLEDGE FROM CARTER ON ARMS-FUND RISE

Nunn, Jackson and Tower Call Pact  
Flawed Without Such Vow —  
Kissinger Repeats Stand

By CHARLES MOHR  
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Aug. 2 — Three Senators demanded today that President Carter furnish a detailed and prompt accounting of his intentions on defense spending before the Senate considers the nuclear arms treaty with the Soviet Union.

Former Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger, meanwhile, firmly reiterated an earlier statement that he, too, favored delaying action on the treaty until a new military program had been placed before Congress and that he would recommend rejection of the treaty if this and other conditions were not met by Mr. Carter.

Mr. Kissinger and Senator Sam Nunn, Democrat of Georgia, made clear that those actions were being taken to dispel interpretations by some politicians, officials and journalists that they had earlier intended to express support for the arms treaty.

## Seriousness of Position Stressed

Both men stressed today that they were serious in advocating that the treaty be rejected unless it was accompanied by a binding commitment to seek greater military strength.

Senator Nunn was joined by Senators Henry M. Jackson, Democrat of Washington, and John Tower, Republican of Texas, in signing a letter to President Carter saying the treaty was unworthy of ratification without "real increases of at least 4 to 5 percent" in the overall defense budget.

Mr. Kissinger's testimony to the Senate Armed Services Committee drew a sharp response from a strong advocate of the treaty, Senator John C. Culver, Democrat of Iowa, who directed a mixture of ridicule, sarcasm and scorn at the former Secretary of State.

## Euphoria and Cynicism

While Mr. Kissinger sat with impassive calm, Senator Culver asserted that the "current public cynicism and disenchantment" with United States foreign policy stems "from the euphoria that you, frankly, helped generate" when in office for two Republican Presidents.

Of Mr. Kissinger's suggestion before the Foreign Rel

tween future arms-limitation negotiations and greater Soviet restraint in world trouble spots, the Iowa Senator said the former diplomat was "raising a battered cliché to the stature of a moral imperative."

With insufficient time to answer all the charges that Senator Culver directed against him, Mr. Kissinger remarked, "I wish to stipulate that I do not agree."

With Congress about to begin a month's recess, the first round of hearings on the treaty in three Senate committees ended today. There was more than one note of acrimony during the day.

Gen. Alexander M. Haig Jr., the retired Supreme Allied Commander in Europe, told Senator Joseph R. Biden Jr. that he deeply resented what the general took as an implication by the Senator that an ambition to win the Republican Presidential nomination had caused General Haig to refuse to endorse the treaty.

## Day's Other Developments

There were these other developments in the treaty debate:

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee released a letter from Adm. Stansfield Turner, the Director of Central Intelligence, saying that the United States will be able to monitor most of the treaty's provisions "well enough to provide confidence that the Soviets cannot

gain a substantial strategic advantage through cheating." For "the few" provisions that cannot be monitored with that degree of confidence, Admiral Turner said, the risk of being caught would make cheating unattractive to the Russians.

Senator Barry Goldwater of Arizona, the ranking Republican member of the Intelligence Committee, said on the Senate floor that the United States can do "an acceptable job" of treaty verification.

## Many Senators Satisfied

These affirmations of the ability to monitor came after many senators had privately said that they were increasingly satisfied that verification was no longer a major issue.

Senator George McGovern, Democrat of South Dakota, remarked at the Foreign Relations Committee that some senators are somewhat disturbed that the treaty itself is being pushed aside as an issue by the attention focused on the question of defense spending.

Senator Nunn has previously indicated that he has no insurmountable objections to the terms of the treaty and would probably support it if the President approves considerably more defense spending and does so this fall, well ahead of the normal budget schedule. Senators Jackson and Tower both indicated through staff assistants that they would not necessarily vote for the treaty even if Mr. Carter did increase military expenditures.